

REMARKS

According to our records, the specification was filed with an abstract as numbered page 9. With this Amendment, the Applicant is adding the abstract by amendment to the specification above as it appears in our records.

Claims 1 to 3 are amended. New claims 6 to 9 are added.

Rejections under 35 USC 112 have been addressed by appropriate amendments.

Claim 1 has been amended so as to distinguish further over Urano. Firstly, claim 1 relates to a receiver whereas the cited portions of Urano relate to transmitters. Specifically, as mentioned in column 3, line 40, Figure 8 shows an encoder, parts of which are described in column 9, lines 21 to 35 and in column 9, lines 50 to 53 in relation to Figure 12, see column 9, lines 37 to 39. Furthermore, column 14, lines 57 to 60, which relate to Figures 17 and 21, see column 12, lines 51 to 52 and column 3, lines 59 to 65, also relates to an encoder.

Secondly, the Examiner is incorrect in his objection under 35 USC 102 against previous claim 1. For example, column 14, lines 57 to 60 in Urano relates to a different system to that shown in Figure 12 such that there is no anticipation. For example, dispersion value comparator 232 in Figure 12 appears to compare outputs from four different dispersion value calculators 216, 226, 228, 230 so as to choose between various types of compression during coding, see column 10 line 52 to column 11 line 2. This is in contrast to the present invention which concerns decompression and decoding at a receiver, involving comparison of current and previous frames to determine whether interframe-prediction format was applied or not.

Furthermore, for example, the passage cited in column 14, lines 57 to 60 does not teach comparison of that result with a signal direct from the decoder indicating whether or not inter-frame prediction was applied in compression before transmission.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 were indicated as being rejected under 35 USC 102. However, no reasoning was provided as to how the extra features referred to in those dependent claims were disclosed by Urano. Nevertheless, this is believed to now be moot, as these claims 2, 3 and 5 now depend on what is believed to be an allowable amended base claim, and so are allowable not least on that basis.

New claim 6 corresponds to previous claim 4, against which no 35 USC 102 objection was raised, amended into independent form.

New claim 7 is added and corresponding in a broad sense with new claim 1.


New dependent claims 8 and 9 broadly correspond with claims 2 and 5.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance. In the event of any fees inadvertently omitted or any improper payment of fees, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No.12-2325 to correct the error now or during the pendency of this application.

If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone conversation would be helpful, please contact Julio Garceran at (908) 582-7294.

Respectfully submitted,

Faruk Mehmet Eryurtlu

By: 
Julio A. Garceran, Attorney
Reg. No. 37,138

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 10/27/04